



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/694,521

10/27/2003

Larry Lee Roundy

199-0205US

1892

29855

7590

05/18/2009

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,
L.L.P.

20333 SH 249 6th Floor
HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER

SMITH, MARCUS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/694,521	Applicant(s) ROUNDY ET AL.	
	Examiner MARCUS R. SMITH	Art Unit 2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 7 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/30/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner disagrees with the applicant that Kohler fails to teach answering the second incoming call and placing it in the first state after the first incoming call progresses to second state. The applicant column 10, lines 56-58 of Kohler which teaches that the first call is never answered and the second call is passed to second state in steps 910 and 911. However, the examiner cited in column 10, lines 40-45, which teaches that the first call is answered (second state) and then moved on to the second call in the queue after a delay in steps 905 and 902. Yes, Kohler teaches many ways or methods of handling calls, but it only takes one of those methods to teach claimed invention for it to be used as prior art. Thus, the applicant arguing that the Kohler can not teach the claimed invention because step 905 can be bypassed is misleading; since, the examiner is using Kohler's invention to teach the claim invention when the step 905 is not bypassed. When the step 905 is implemented, the Kohler's invention will not proceed to implement steps 910 and 911.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2419

3. Claims 1-2, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kohler et al. (US 5,206,903).

Regarding to claim 1 (see figure 9), Kohler teaches a method for processing incoming calls comprising: receiving at least first and second incoming calls (steps 900, 901: column 10, lines 15-25: ACD receives incoming calls), retaining the first incoming call in a first state (step 902, column 10, lines 25-30, it is examines the oldest (first) call in the queue.), waiting until the first incoming call progresses to a second state (Step 905 :column 10, lines 40-45), answering the second incoming call and placing it in the first state after the first incoming call progresses to the second state (column 10, lines 40-45: after step 905, it goes back to steps 901,902), and transitioning the second incoming call in the first state to a second state (after 902, it transitions to step 905 : column 10, lines 40-45).

Regarding to claim 2, Kohler further teaches that the first state is a pending answer state (where the call is the head of queue waiting to be process; step 902) and the second state is a call connected state (step 905. column 10, lines 35-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-6, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohler in view of Crouch et al. (US 7,180,888).

Regarding to claims 5, and 9 (see figure 9), Kohler teaches a method for processing incoming calls comprising: receiving at least first and second incoming calls (steps 900, 901: column 10, lines 15-25: ACD receives incoming calls), retaining the first incoming call in a first state (step 902, column 10, lines 25-30, it is examines the oldest (first) call in the queue.), waiting until the first incoming call progresses to a second state (Step 905 :column 10, lines 40-45), answering the second incoming call and placing it in the first state after the first incoming call progresses to the second state (column 10, lines 40-45: after step 905, it goes back to steps 901,902 (also see step 911)), and transitioning the second incoming call in the first state to a second state (after 902, it transitions to step 905 : column 10, lines 40-45).

Kohler discloses all of the subject matter as described above except for instructions be on a video conferencing station.

Crouch et al. teaches a network where a gateway receives multiple calls and transfer those calls to its destination (see figures 4 and 6) similar to method taught in Kohler. Crouch teaches how two incoming calls to gateway get processed. The first call is being process by a proxy device while the other wait in a queue until proxy device is finished with the first call (see column 5, lines 55-65 and column 6, lines 25-38). However the system in Crouch invention is updated to operate handle H.323 terminals that can do video conferencing (column 2, lines 35-56). Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to PBX to

Art Unit: 2419

be updated to handle video conferencing station similar to gateway that is taught by Crouch in order to provide the proper resources to handle H.323 stations it is network (column 1, lines 1-21).

Regarding claims 6, and 10, see claim 2.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3, 7, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCUS R. SMITH whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2419

(571)270-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs: 7:30 am - 5:00 p.m. and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj Kumar can be reached on 571 272-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MRS 5/15/09

/Pankaj Kumar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419